



**METROPOLITAN  
TRANSPORTATION  
COMMISSION**

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter  
101 Eighth Street  
Oakland, CA 94607-4700  
TEL 510.817.5700  
TTY/TDD 510.817.5769  
FAX 510.817.5848  
E-MAIL [info@mtc.ca.gov](mailto:info@mtc.ca.gov)  
WEB [www.mtc.ca.gov](http://www.mtc.ca.gov)

**Bill Dodd, Chair**  
Napa County and Cities

**Scott Haggerty, Vice Chair**  
Alameda County

**Tom Ammiano**  
City and County of San Francisco

**Tom Azumbrado**  
U.S. Department of Housing  
and Urban Development

**Tom Bates**  
Cities of Alameda County

**Bob Blanchard**  
Sonoma County and Cities

**Dean J. Chu**  
Cities of Santa Clara County

**Dave Cortese**  
Association of Bay Area Governments

**Dorene M. Giacopini**  
U.S. Department of Transportation

**Federal D. Glover**  
Contra Costa County

**Anne W. Halsted**  
San Francisco Bay Conservation  
and Development Commission

**Steve Kinsey**  
Marin County and Cities

**Sue Lempert**  
Cities of San Mateo County

**Jon Rubin**  
San Francisco Mayor's Appointee

**Bijan Sartipi**  
State Business, Transportation  
and Housing Agency

**James P. Sperring**  
Solano County and Cities

**Adrienne J. Tissier**  
San Mateo County

**Amy Worth**  
Cities of Contra Costa County

**Ken Yeager**  
Santa Clara County

**Steve Heminger**  
Executive Director

**Ann Flemer**  
Deputy Executive Director, Operations

**Andrew B. Fremier**  
Deputy Executive Director,  
Bay Area Toll Authority

**Therese W. McMillan**  
Deputy Executive Director, Policy

**DRAFT**

**MINORITY CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Minutes – May 13, 2008**

**Attendance**

The meeting was called to order at 3:25 p.m. by Chair James McGhee. Those in attendance were Chair James McGhee and Harvey Louie of San Francisco; Vice Chair Darnell Turner of Contra Costa County; Jacquee Castain, Carlos Castellanos and Homira Shafaq of Alameda County; Raphael Durr and Charles Rivasplata of Marin County; Gerald Rico of Napa County; Michael Lopez and Eric Shaw of Santa Clara County; William Allen and Carlos Romero of San Mateo County; Michael D'Augelli, Native American Representative; and Dawn Love, Low Income Representative.

Randi Kinman was excused.

MTC staff in attendance were Christina Atienza, Alea Gage, Pam Grove, Therese Knudsen, Georgia Lambert and Jennifer Yeaman.

Also in attendance were Elizabeth Bent from the San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA) and Carli Paine from the Transportation and Land Use Coalition.

**Meeting Minutes**

The minutes from the April 8, 2008 meeting were approved.

**Chair's Report**

Chair McGhee thanked attendees for arriving at the new start time of 3:15 p.m. and introduced Elizabeth Bent from SFCTA, who had agreed to delay her presentation until MCAC's May meeting when the April meeting ran short of time.

**Mobility and Access Pricing Study**

Elizabeth Bent presented information on SFCTA's study to evaluate the feasibility of using a comprehensive congestion-pricing program to improve mobility in San Francisco. The Bay Area is the second-most congested region in the nation, she said, with half of an average regional trip spent in traffic delay. The goal is to reduce and manage the amount of congestion in San Francisco on a daily basis. When slower speeds and stops related to transit are factored in, the result is that a typical transit trip

**Mobility and Access Pricing Study (Continued)**

is about double the amount of time of the corresponding auto trip in San Francisco. Because San Francisco is a transit-first city, they would like to see transit times improved. Impacts of congestion on the economy and environment are also being tracked, and they are looking for ways to improve all of those statistics. Other cities who have congestion pricing include London, where focus on improvements to the city bus network saw faster, more frequent service from Day One of their 11-hours-a-day congestion management flat fee system for entering the “gateway”; Stockholm focused on regional access and saw new park’n’ride spaces and improvements to their bus network with implement of a fee focused on peak hours in persistently congested areas; and in Rome they added new bus lines and express bus lines.

She also discussed the complementary congestion management effort focused on replacement of Doyle Drive. The Doyle Drive Value Pricing program is the centerpiece of the San Francisco Bay Area’s Urban Partnership program, which will bring in \$158 million in congestion management improvements. Approval of the Doyle Drive environmental impact report is expected in July 2008, with construction projected to begin in 2009; to qualify for the grant fund, a toll on the road must start in 2009.

Mr. Castellanos asked about the European models and how this system would be selected. Mr. Louie asked if there are any U.S. cities that currently have congestion pricing; Ms. Bent said no other U.S. city has implemented congestion pricing similar to what is being considered here. Mr. Allen said pros and cons need to be carefully studied because San Francisco traffic patterns are quite different than Rome’s, for example, and future fuel price increases need to be taken into consideration. Ms. Bent agreed that alternatives need to respond to local conditions. Various MCAC members commented on pricing – Mr. Rivasplata asked how revenues would be spent; Mr. Romero inquired how potentially disproportionate pricing schemes would be measured; Mr. D’Augelli asked why charge a toll at all; and Mr. Lopez queried the policy for businesses and residents located within the toll zone. Ms. Bent commented that they plan to look into whether low-income commuters drive or take transit during peak commute hours to fully understand how congestion pricing will impact their commute. They are looking into programs that can be designed to address these concerns. She also commented that there is an opportunity to invest Doyle Drive revenues back into an existing transit system. Ms. Bent further stated there is a need to maintain our infrastructure while maximizing its efficiency – our current tax system only provides between 40-60% of transportation costs. She also responded that businesses within the zone would be subject to the same pricing scheme (although there is a possibility of a fleet rate for larger companies), and they are still evaluating the best way to deal with toll zone residents.

**Subcommittee Reports**

**Lifeline/EJ:** Vice Chair Turner summarized the subcommittee’s meeting on the Lifeline guidelines for 2009-2011. The subcommittee reviewed the guidelines and had a lively discussion. The subcommittee accepted the staff recommendations with some modifications for clarification. One of the key points was regarding local control; the recommendation from staff is to leave it as it is, and the subcommittee agreed that the local control is where it should be – at the lowest level with the CMAs. There was some discussion about MTC taking a stronger role, possibly more regulatory. The concept of a universal fare was recommended as important for consideration, as well as closing the gaps in low-income service. Vice Chair Turner sent some information to staff, “The 2008 HHS Poverty Guidelines,” which are issued annually in the *Federal Register* by the Department of Health and Human Services. These guidelines contain information broken down

by county of the number of individuals that are low income (and also by city). The issue of equity also was discussed. MCAC members would participate in a review committee for each county so they would have a greater involvement in the process.

It was also felt that there should be more monitoring and accountability on some of the areas where gaps exist, particularly in determining where some of the funds are being spent, as shown in the report. Therese Knudsen, MTC planner, said that MTC staff has been working on the evaluation of the Lifeline program. Comments will be compiled and incorporated into the guidelines, which will be taken before the Commission in June. Once the guidelines have been approved, a new Call for Projects will begin with a \$70 million program over three years (with more projects to be funded through Lifeline). Regarding program administration, the subcommittee suggested that any administrative fees not exceed 10%. Vice Chair Turner said that the 10% figure is based on federal government grant fee guidelines. The Lifeline/EJ subcommittee report was approved.

Ms. Grove added that MCAC's comments on the Lifeline Program Evaluation Report, as summarized in a May 7 memorandum mailed to MCAC members, were being forwarded to the Programming and Allocations Committee on May 14.

**T2035 Equity Analysis:** Subcommittee Chair Carlos Castellanos reported that the subcommittee met on April 15 and May 1, and MTC staff presented two options for proceeding with the equity analysis. Option 1 was to continue with the travel model that has been used for previous RTPs; Option 2 was to do the longer-term analysis using the travel model, but to also include a short-term base-year analysis. This second option would allow a look at today, equity-wise, as opposed to only forecasting 25 or 30 years out. The subcommittee felt there are certain limitations with the current model, and would like to see a better long-range forecasting model. Therefore, the subcommittee felt that Option 2, with a base-year evaluation regarding communities of concern, was the better of the two options. The subcommittee wants to continue to meet and work beyond this equity analysis to find ways to measure disparities and gaps that committee members see in communities of concern. It was moved and approved that the official report from the subcommittee be accepted, and that Option 2 be requested for use as the T2035 Equity Analysis.

Carli Paine from the Transportation and Land Use Coalition commented on the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) overall analysis and thanked MCAC for their active role in approval of the RTP. She submitted a platform for the RTP reflecting the work of TALC and their thoughts on what MTC can do to pursue the goals that they have adopted and make a Bay Area transportation system that is healthy, serves everyone and is sustainable. Two issues in the RTP evaluation process were of concern: 1) A quantitative "benefit cost" evaluation, and 2) a qualitative evaluation. A benefit cost evaluation tells how well projects do at reducing congestion, which is only one goal of many that MTC has adopted for this RTP. The qualitative evaluation tells how well investments do on all of the goals. For example, Lifeline and the Regional Bike Network don't do so well in the quantitative evaluation because those are two kinds of investments that don't do a whole lot to reduce congestion, but on the qualitative side, they do quite well. She also said that local control over funds is good in many cases, but that there are certain pots of money where it really makes sense to maintain control at the regional level, for efficiency and for oversight. MTC commissioners are being urged to give local control to the CMAs, but she feels it's important to support some control at the regional level as well.

**High School Internship:** Mr. D’Augelli reported that Ann Macaulay from MTC Human Resources gave a presentation regarding progress on the high school internship program. A total of 156 high school applications were received, and 147 were complete and are being considered. There was some concern with lack of applicants in some of the counties (like Marin and Sonoma), and extra outreach in those areas resulted in more applications. There are 25 jobs available, and to date 31 of the 147 applications have been forwarded to the agencies and the rest are being processed. He offered kudos to Jamila Williams, MTC intern, and other MTC staff, for their work. June 17 is the initial orientation for the students, and Ms. Love urged MCAC members to attend the orientation and meet the students. Further details on the orientation will be sent to members. It was moved and approved to accept the subcommittee report.

**Advisory Council:** Chair McGhee was unable to attend the April Advisory Council meeting. Mr. Durr attended and stated the Advisory Council reviewed most of the same items discussed at the April MCAC meeting.

### **Staff Report**

Ms. Grove announced that MCAC’s annual dinner is scheduled to follow the June 10 meeting. This year’s theme is Latino, and Cocina Poblana, a Mexican restaurant in Jack London Square, has been selected. All but one MCAC member present agreed that they had no conflicts with the proposed dinner date. Invitations will be mailed shortly. MTC’s Draft Program Management Plan is on MTC’s Web site and available for review; comments should be directed to Christina Atienza, MTC staff member, by May 23. Ms. Grove reminded the committee about the remaining Transportation 2035 regional workshops and the final Transportation 2035 Joint Advisors Workshop scheduled for June 5 from 12:30-2:30 p.m.; lunch will be provided. She also reminded the committee that the deadline for MTC’s awards nominations is Friday, May 23<sup>rd</sup>, and she encouraged members to submit nominations. In addition, Ms. Grove drew the committee’s attention to an article provided by Mr. Louie regarding Michael Rubiano, MCAC member.

### **Other Business/Public Comment**

Ms. Love urged MCAC members to attend AC Transit’s public hearing regarding fare changes to be held on May 21 at 4 p.m. at the Oakland City Council Chambers. Mr. Shaw was elected as vice chair for policy for the black community division of the American Planning Association; any input or support MCAC members have would be appreciated. Chair McGhee urged MCAC members to attend the Transportation 2035 public workshops. Mr. D’Augelli announced that he had met the Caltrans Native American representative at the Santa Rosa T2035 workshop and he also plans to connect with the Native American liaisons in more cities. Ms. Castain urged MCAC members to encourage agencies that are using MTC’s high school interns to hire an additional high school intern.

### **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, June 8, 2008, beginning at 3:15 p.m.